

REMARKS

According to the present office action, claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-10, 12, 14-16, 19-20, 22-27, 29-30, 32-34, 37-38, and 40-56 are pending in the application and these same claims stand rejected.

Objection to Specification

In view of the above amendments, the Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for withdrawing the previous § 112 rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for withdrawing the previous § 101 rejections, and herein the Applicant has addressed the current rejections regarding claims 10, 20, and 27.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Exemplary claim 1 recites the following subject matter:

A method for logging while updating a B-link tree via a plurality of data transactions, comprising:

generating at least one log entry corresponding to a data transaction of the plurality of data transactions, the data transaction to be carried out on said B-link tree, wherein said at least one log entry includes at least one entry from an allocation layer and at least one entry from a B-link tree layer, wherein said at least one entry from said allocation layer is local to its corresponding computing device of a plurality of computing devices and said at least one entry from said B-link tree layer is replicated among said plurality of computing devices;

storing said at least one log entry in a partially persistent log, wherein a tail of said partially persistent log is in a memory, and said partially persistent log comprises of said memory and a persistent storage; and

wherein a boundary between said memory and said persistent storage in said partially persistent log varies over time.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2557/304882.01
Application No.: 10/674,676
Office Action Dated: February 26, 2008

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

Support for the new amendment can be found at least in paragraph [0068]. This paragraph builds on previously discussed paragraphs, namely, paragraphs [0065] – [0067] discussed during the telephonic interview and response to office action.

The other independent claims, namely, claims 12, 22, 29, 38, 46, 51, 53, and 55 also recite similar limitations. Insofar as the dependent claims incorporate the limitations of the independent claims, they define over the art for similar reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that the present remarks are responsive to each of the points raised by the examiner in the official action, and submits that claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-10, 12, 14-16, 19-20, 22-27, 29-30, 32-34, 37-38, and 40-56 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: June 26, 2008

/ Grzegorz S. Plichta /
Grzegorz S. Plichta
Registration No. 55,541

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439